DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 436 CE 061 940

AUTHOR Rider-Hankins, Peg
TITLE The Educational Process in Juvenile Correctional Schools. Review of the Research.
INSTITUTION American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill. Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 Jan 92
CONTRACT 85-JS-CX-0003
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Correctional Education; *Correctional Institutions; Correctional Rehabilitation; Delinquent Rehabilitation; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational History; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Objectives; Institutionalized Persons; *Law Related Education; Learning Disabilities; Literature Reviews; Prisoners; Rehabilitation Programs; *Role of Education; Secondary Education; Skill Development; Special Needs Students; Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Methods; *Thinking Skills

ABSTRACT

Correctional education has a long history dating to 1790. Political, legal, economic, and numerical realities have shaped its direction more frequently than the educational needs of inmates. Education is seen as serving a variety of purposes: behavior control, empowerment, change in personal behavior and values, and reduction in recidivism. The organizational structure--decentralized, bureau model, or correctional school district model--affects the way educational decisions are made and implemented. Traditionally prepared teachers are not equipped to teach in a correctional school and are often unsure about their role. An effective teacher is mature, creative, self-aware, flexible, sincere, and student centered. Students have educational, family, behavior, mental health, and physical problems. A key issue is learning disabilities and deficiencies. The latest trends focus on cognitive skill development and the integration of rehabilitation and education. A key area that has been largely neglected is transition back to the community. Emerging changes in correctional education are linked to needs of confined learners, concepts of personal development, and empowerment. The cognitive model has implications for education in both prevention and rehabilitation efforts. Law-related education can be a vehicle for intrainstitutional cooperation and cooperation between the education, treatment, and corrections systems. (Appendixes include definitions and 136 references.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349436

Review of the Research:
The Educational Process in Juvenile Correctional Schools

Peg Rider-Hankins
American Bar Association
Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship

January 31, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P Rider-Hankins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Preparation of this paper is made possible by a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, grant number 85-JS-CX-0003. Please do not quote or cite without permission of author.

CE061940

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The conditions of education in juvenile correctional institutions are extraordinary with respect to the population served, the schedule, and the priorities. Garfunkel (1986) states "correctional education must develop effective education programs for students who have not succeeded in an educational system that was not designed to meet their needs or deal with their circumstances." The role of education is significant for residents in terms of time spent, commitment, and overall treatment planning.

Educational interventions within the Juvenile Justice System can occur at four different points: predelinquency with drop-out prevention and alternative education programs; diversionary and adjudicatory with diversion and detention education programs; dispositional with probation programs, community-based residential facilities, and training schools; and re-entry or transition with parole or probation programs (Wolford, 1985).

The target audiences for this review of the research are educators and newcomers to the field of correctional education. The primary purpose is to conduct a review of research and evaluation studies related to the educational process that takes place in detention and training schools. This paper will synthesize relevant data collected and suggest preliminary implications for the use of Law-Related Education (LRE) in juvenile justice settings.

LRE has proved to be an effective delinquency prevention tool. It is an effective vehicle in educating delinquent youth about citizenship and the characteristics and qualities needed to live successfully in a democratic society (Hunter, 1987; Buzzell, 1988).

The results of this review of the research can assist educators in schools and correctional schools and corrections professionals
in the following ways:

- to inform about correctional education and to enhance understanding of delinquent youth;
- to provide a tool for communication between the education and correction systems about delinquent youth; and
- to provide LRE organizations with information about the juvenile correctional education process so they can more effectively plan and develop appropriate LRE materials and strategies.

METHOD

Corrections and education periodicals were reviewed. The following sources for information about appropriate periodicals and studies were consulted: corrections professionals and organizations, the Yearbook of Correctional Education, the Current Index to Journals in Education, the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, the Criminal Justice and Periodical Index, Criminology and Penology Abstracts, clearinghouses, and the reference lists at the end of articles. (A detailed list of organizations and clearinghouses can be found in the appendix.)

This review has been limited to articles published after 1980, with the exception of two articles deemed important to the issues being considered. Articles reviewed but determined to be inappropriate are listed in the bibliography in the appendix.

When the study was conceived, the following components of the educational process were identified: organizational structure, teaching methodology, and student and teacher characteristics. How were these components, and others not yet identified, manifested in a school in a correctional facility? What was relevant in the education of delinquents in schools in correctional settings?

Articles were reviewed to identify elements of the juvenile correctional education process that would assist in adapting LRE materials and strategies to juvenile justice settings, and that would provide non-correctional educators, or newcomers to correctional education, background information on correctional education. Because the audience includes people who might not be familiar with corrections terminology, a list of key terms is included in the appendix.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Correctional education in the United States began in 1790 in Philadelphia. By the 1820s Sabbath schools which included instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, along with religious instruction were introduced in several states. The New York House of Refuge became the first juvenile reformatory in the United States in 1824. The education of juveniles increased and improved in the 1850s with the establishment of juvenile reformatories and prison libraries, provision of basic education services, and employment of teachers. During the 1870s teaching basic reading and writing skills expanded to an organized system of formal academic, vocational, and social education. Three major events occurred in the 1890s which affected juvenile correctional education: mandated responsibility to county boards of education for educating juvenile wards of the court, the first juvenile court, and the introduction of high school curriculum as part of correctional education (Eggleston, 1986 and 1990; Angle, 1982; DeGraw, 1987; Gehring, 1985).

Correctional education has recently become a formal concern for the federal government. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1974 (29 USC 794) guarantees the handicapped minor the right to special education services. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) extends that right to all incarcerated persons ages 21 and under (Warboys, 1986). Not until "1984 did the U.S. Department of Education issue a policy statement on correctional education, indicating that education is a necessity for every American including the more than 2.2 million adults and juveniles who are under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system" (Wolford, 1985). After having been in operation for a decade, the Office of Correctional Education in the Department of Education was authorized in the Carl D. Perkins Vocation and Applied Technology Amendments of 1991. It is responsible for coordinating correctional education activities within the Department of Education, cooperating with other Federal agency correctional programs and administering discretionary contracts and grants for the Office of Vocation and Adult Education (Schwartz, 1991). In 1990 the National Training and Dissemination Project with funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention under the Department of Justice, began expanding its LRE efforts into juvenile justice settings. The commitment to educating offenders as "a means of social reintegration upon release is widely accepted by practitioners in the correctional field, as well as being an integral part of society's belief and hope in rehabilitation" (Reffett, 1983).

The professional corrections community has been slow to recognize the uniqueness of juvenile correctional education. The American Correctional Association's standards relative to juvenile corrections, revised in 1983, did not address the mandates of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Nor is any of its nine standards dealing with education mandatory for accreditation. In 1988 the Correctional Education Association developed comprehensive standards for adult and juvenile correctional education programs, covering programming, administrative, staff, and student issues. There is no history of systematic program evaluation beyond counting numbers of participants. The institutional characteristics and complex environment, lack of technical expertise and interest, and weak course and program design all contribute to a lack of quality program evaluation (Bell, 1990; CEA, 1988; Gehring, 1988 and 1989; Wolford, 1985 and 1987).

GOALS AND PURPOSES OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

Correctional education began to emerge as a unique subset of the education profession during Zebulon Brockway's tenure at the Elmira, New York, Reformatory in the last quarter of the 19th century. It was consolidated by 1931 with the establishment of the Correctional Education Association and the publication of The Education of Adult Prisoners by Austin McCormick. However, these efforts ended with the onset of World War II. Correctional education re-emerged in the 1970s. It is a profession attempting to define its goals and purposes in a complex and often hostile environment. The impetus for professional identity has come from the need for more training and direction in providing educational services and the desire for support as correctional educators try to survive in their institutions. Political, legal, economic, and numerical realities shape the direction of correctional education more frequently than the educational needs of inmates. "Administrators are preoccupied with maintaining order and security. Teachers find it difficult to concentrate on subject matter when students' psychological needs beg for attention. Students place short-term needs before long-term needs" (Sedlak, 1987). (Collins, 1988; Pecht, 1983; Duguid, 1990; Brown, 1990; Westat, 1991; Michalek, 1988; Wolford, 1987; Gehring, 1988 and 1990; Degraw, 1987; Bell, 1990; Sedlak, 1990).

Education programs serve a variety of purposes in the correctional institution: controlling behavior thus decreasing the levels of violence and tension; improving the quality of life inside the institution; providing a way for inmates to broaden their understanding and knowledge base and to acquire basic academic and vocational skills via a positive academic experience; training inmates in moral and civic responsibility; providing them with the opportunity to change their personal behavior and values; reducing recidivism; and providing a more educated workforce to support the overall operation of the institution.

Many educators view correctional education as a way to empower offenders with "the tools, the context, and even the will for the free and informed exercise of judgement and choice. . . They recognize that their students have unique qualities, deficits, and needs, that their environment is unique and that behavioral outcomes are probably as important as educational outcomes" (Duguid, 1988). Education can offer an alternative identity, new languages, rituals, commitments and allegiances, and lifestyles with the establishment of bonds to the conventional world. To many authors, education is considered part of the rehabilitation program even though its goal is learning while rehabilitation's goal is personality change and subsequent post-release success (Collins, 1988; Pecht, 1983; Duguid, 1988 and 1990; Brown, 1990; Westat, 1991; Michalek, 1988; Wolford, 1987; Gehring, 1988 and 1990; Degraw, 1987; Bell, 1990; Sedlak, 1990).

Other educators believe that the underlying process of how inmates learn is as important, if not more important, than achievement of degrees and diplomas. For them, the integration of education and treatment approaches forecasts the future of correctional education. They suggest the following goals for correctional education:

- an antidote to prisonization (the adoption of the prison culture) by raising inmates self-esteem and achievement levels and instilling a more mature sense of values;
- curriculum to promote the adoption of the appropriate socially-oriented thinking patterns and enhance the will via the discipline of study;
- stimulation of students with collaborative work habits and projects;
- assistance to students in setting realistic goals with regards to vocation and family life with teachers as mentors and facilitators;
- support to students in their search for an improved self-image and self-esteem (Duguid, 1990; Brown, 1990; Sedlak, 1990; Homant, 1984; Fabiano, 1991; Merren, 1991; Roby (1991; Albrecht, 1991; Rabak, 1991; Goldstein, 1986; Van Nagel, 1986; CEA, 1988)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

The state governmental body with the responsibility for juvenile correctional facilities varies by state. In most, juvenile facilities are administered by state child welfare or social service agencies or by their own department of youth services. Several states, including Massachusetts, Kentucky, and Utah, have decentralized their institutions. Educational programs, philosophies, and options are very different in these states compared to the states with training schools holding hundreds of youth.

There are three organizational structures in correctional education. The type of organizational structure directly impacts the way educational decisions are made and implemented within an institution. (1) In the decentralized structure, each institution and its school is an independent entity within the system. The administrator's philosophy of education is the major factor in curriculum issues and teaching methodology. He or she has control over educational decisions. (2) The bureau model consists of educational supervisors within the state corrections office who have the authority to recommend policies on curriculum, education personnel, budgets, and teaching methodology to the administrator who can either accept or reject them. (3) In the correctional school district model, the State Department of Education assigns the rights, privileges, and duties of a local education agency to the State Department of Corrections or its equivalent which serves as the vehicle for pass-through funding. This model existed for a few years in New Jersey in the early 1900s. It reappeared in Texas in 1969. The education program complies with institution rules and can be viewed as an "institution within an institution." Contracting with outside organizations, such as local school districts, to provide services can occur under any of these three structures.

In a 1989 state-by state survey of correctional education organization structures, Gehring found that the predominant organizational structure for juvenile institutions was the bureau model. Of the remaining juvenile institutions, the decentralized model was almost twice as common as the correctional school district. These organizational structures which do not place education as the primary function or goal contribute to the difficulties that correctional educators face in educating inmates. However, the trend for states considering reorganization of their correctional education system is to adopt the correctional school district. Unfortunately, juvenile systems are not keeping pace with adult systems in adopting the correctional school district (Wolford, 1985 and 1987; Bullock, 1983; Gehring, 1985, 1988, and 1990; Eggleston, 1986; Sedlak, 1990).

THE SETTING

The school setting consists of school structure, academic climate, teacher practices, and collegiality (teachers' interactions focused on improving classroom instruction). Problems with workload and nonteaching responsibilities, appear to have the greatest effect on orderly school climate and teachers' attitudes toward their jobs. In a public school a principal's leadership is the strongest predictor of school climate. (Hawkins, 1987) In a correctional institution, it is the administrator who sets the tone.

Correctional schools are found in two primary settings-- detention centers and training schools. Communication between the home school and the correctional school is usually rare due to staff limitations at the correctional facility. Therefore, the parent or guardian is burdened with providing information to both the home school and the institution. The focus of correctional education programs is to keep the students current with their class assignments from their home schools, enhance academic skills, help maintain the fragile educational relationship between youth and education, provide remedial education, aid in transition to the next educational situation, and incorporate specialized education methodology that meets minimum state educational standards. Providing educational services in a detention setting is difficult due to the very short lengths of stay. Youth are placed in detention for control and protection while they await disposition of their cases. The short lengths of stay, differing abilities and achievement levels, inadequate facilities and

excessive turnover make it difficult to develop and maintain programs that simultaneously rehabilitate, educate, and control. However, detention facilities can provide diagnostic screening and intervention for youth with learning and emotional problems and make recommendations for appropriate services (Amster, 1984; Bullock, 1983; Bosma, 1987; Roush, 1983; Jones, 1989).

Detention education programs have to take into consideration the following rights which they are charged with safeguarding:

- the child's right to be held in an environment conducive to normal growth and development;
- the community's right to protection from youth; and
- the court's right to immediate access to youth for hearings. (Bullock, 1983)

While students' stays at training schools (from a few months to years) are longer than at detention centers (from overnight to a few months), many of the educational issues and goals are similar. Classes have students with different lengths of stay, differing abilities and achievement levels. Youth are pulled out of class for counseling and health care appointments, meetings with attorneys, court appearances, work assignments, or transfers out of the institution due to either release or assignment to another institution. The school schedule is similar to that in a public school although many institutions include group counseling sessions during the day. Many classes are composed of youth functioning at a variety of grade and ability levels. Therefore, much of the teaching is done via individualized learning packets emphasizing basic skills (Westat, 1991). Sherer (1983) found that students' interest in learning and achievement resembled a U-shape with a decrease during the middle of their incarceration and then an increase as they neared their time of release.

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHING CONDITIONS

Correctional schools operate the entire year. In some states, teachers teach the entire year. In others, teachers have ten month contracts. Temporary teachers are hired and school schedules are adjusted to accomodate teacher contracts. They may be the only state-certified employees in the institution, have better benefits, salary and working hours than other employees in the institution, and be supervised by someone outside the facility. Security needs are emphasized and teachers need to be vigilant for the potential of escape and the misuse of instructional materials (e.g., scissors being used as a weapon). Teachers may be pulled from teaching responsibilities to fulfill security and child care duties. There is a lack of funds for substitute teachers, teacher aides and quality materials and equipment. Pecht (1983) reports correctional educators feel confused about whether the function of the corrections system is retribution or rehabilitation.

In general, traditionally-prepared teachers are not equipped to teach in a correctional school. They often lack the sophistication and "street-smarts" to effectively teach and survive in the institutional setting. Educators are often unsure about their role in the correctional system. Some go about their jobs without learning about the corrections field and institutions. Some identify with the corrections staff and put a higher priority on security, personal advancement or some other agenda unrelated to education. Correctional education teachers have a high rate of job turnover and tend to be less experienced. Many identify with their content area rather than correctional education. Many have concerns about their personal safety and feel ill-at-ease in a confined atmosphere. Juvenile facility staff are exposed to verbal abuse, threats, and/or physical violence. They are targets of institutional "games" played by inmates. (See "Student Characteristics" for further description.) Many of the teachers have had little or no experience with delinquent students whose backgrounds differ from their own. Mesenger (1984) states that correctional education teachers "are typically female, Caucasian, and middle-class. . . . Just out of adolescence themselves they are easy marks for power plays. They are frequently bewildered when their adolescent pupils do not respond as expected to their manifest good will. Chauvinistic attitudes by delinquent males toward female teachers create problems . . ." Teachers' attitudes toward residents tend to differ from those of correctional staff. Educators place greater emphasis on factors relevant to residents'

lives after they are released as opposed to factors inside the institution such as security which tends to be the area emphasized by correctional staff. Gehring (1985) states that correctional educators as a group "are dedicated, frustrated, burned-out."

The personality traits of an effective correctional education teacher includes maturity, creativity, self-awareness, flexibility, sincerity, and the ability to tolerate a high degree of stress. Effective teachers are student-centered and have an investment in their students personal growth, as well as their own. They are sensitive to their students' situations and accept that some students will project their own pain onto their teachers. They are respectful of their students and use their sense of humor to cope. (Forbes, 1991; Bartollas, 1983; Brown, 1990; Farmer, 1990; Pecht, 1983; Pecht-Miller, 1987; Reffett, 1983; Garfunkel, 1986; Gehring, 1985, 1988, and 1989; Roush, 1983; Bell, 1990; DeGraw, 1987; Eggleston, 1986; Wolford, 1987; Van Nagel, 1986; Pasternak, 1988; Sedlak, 1990)

As cited in Pecht (1983), "Reagen and Stoughten's definition of the educator's role: Corrections is designed for custody and control. Education's purpose is freedom, growth, and self-actualization. The correctional educator must, at the minimum, maintain an island of sanity in a storm of psychosis. At the most, he must work to change the entire system."

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

By the time a young person enters a juvenile justice institution, he or she has been in a downward spiral for most, if not all, of his or her life. The child who arrives at the institution is usuallydefiant, resentful, indifferent or hostile, hurt, frustrated, full of feelings of fear and inadequacy--a casualty of the child care and educational systems. He or she is a lonely failure, usually a throw-away child, who has built a wall of defenses that defies anyone to break through. The child has been exposed to "lethal clusters, or combinations, of educational, developmental, and health factors" (Meltzer, 1984). Hawkins (1989) describes "multiple domains of risk factors" and adds family and environmental factors to the three previously listed.

The average incarcerated youth comes from an economically deprived and disorganized neighborhood, which has a failing physical environment, high rates of mobility, and high crime rates. Although delinquency is present in all socio-economic strata, the majority of offenders, especially those charged with violent crimes, most often come from the lower socioeconomic group and are an ethnic minority (Noblit,1976; Hawkins, 1989; Finn, 1988; Cook, 1990; Amster, 1984; Gagne, 1977; Duguid, 1990; Rabak, 1991; and Westendorp, 1986). Between 1985 and 1989, there has been a 20% increase in youth confined. As of 1989 minority youth comprise 60% of the population in facilities supported by governmental bodies. Since 1987 there has been a 13% increase in minority youth, a 5% decrease in white youth, an 8% increase in youth being held for violence against persons and a 4% decrease in youth held for property crimes (Allen-Hagen, 1991).

Education problems include low achievement levels, lack of interest in and commitment to learning and school, discipline problems, and poor attendance (Noblit, 1976; Rabak, 1991; Gagne, 1977; Rincker, 1990; Walker, 1991; Westat, 1991; Westendorp, 1986; Mayer, 1982; Finn, 1988; Hawkins, 1989 and 1987; Davidson, 1988; Bullock, 1990; Carter, 1987; and Meltzer, 1984).

Alienation and isolation from family, school, and community result in hostility and patterns of learned helplessness. Vandalism and alcohol and other drug use at school are expressions of youths' alienation (Thomas, 1983; Noblit, 1976; Rabak, 1991; Duguid, 1990; Novotny, 1991; Ball, 1982; Bullock, 1990; Hawkins, 1987 and 1989; and Finn, 1988).

Family management practices and family functioning are poor, if existent. Most youth come from a single-parent home (almost always with a female head of household) or a home with a stepparent. The family unit is usually dysfunctional due to parental drug and alcohol abuse and/or mental illness; poor parental practices and supervision; parental rejection and neglect; verbal, emotional,

physical, and sexual abuse; poor communication; a high degree of conflict; and isolation and alienation from other family members (Bullock, 1990; Hawkins, 1987 and 1989; Duguid, 1990; and Gagne, 1977).

The incarcerated youth usually began to display persistent behavior problems at an early age and engages in high risk activities. (For 83% of delinquents, first use of alcohol and other drugs often occurs prior to age 14.) Most were put in placements when young and moved through a series of placements as their behavior became more disturbed. Most have failed in these placements due to violence or absconding. He or she is rarely a first-time offender and has an extensive prior arrest record. Incarcerated youth are very "street-smart" and knowledgeable about the juvenile justice system and ways to survive. However, they have unrealistic and inaccurate ideas about job expectations and the competencies needed to survive in legal employment. Because of their youth, they lack the appropriate living skills to deal with anger and frustration (Duguid, 1990; Hawkins, 1989; Bullock, 1990).

Youth in institutions have a higher rate of unaddressed mental health and physical problems and learning deficiencies than their peers outside the institution. There is a very high number of victims of sexual abuse among both male and female juveniles. This abuse has had a negative impact on their mental health (Murphy, 1986; Rincker, 1990; Walker, 1991; Duguid, 1990; Ferguson, 1990; Mayer, 1982; Gagne, 1977; Cook, 1990; Amster, 1984). Gagne (1977) cites speech disorders at 12 times the normal rate and hearing disorders at five times. Low self-esteem and poor self-image are a given for these youth. Ferguson (1990) states that they "vacillate between two extreme self-perceptions-- all-powerful or worthless and hopeless, a victim of life and society."

Less than one-third of all juvenile dispositions in the United States are for females. Consequently a much smaller percentage are confined. Many female facilities have been converted to house the overflow of males. Families tend to put their daughters into mental health rather than correctional facilities. In 1987 the population of public facilities was 64% male and 36% female; whereas the population of private facilities was 62% female and 38% male. Since 1987 there has been an 8% decrease in incarcerated females. Although in the past 10 years females have been confined for more aggressive and violent offenses, the primary reason for their incarceration is status offenses (Allen-Hagen, 1991; and Maguire, 1991). Female offenders are more likely to come from dysfunctional family backgrounds and to have been rejected by their parents. They are generally less educated than males, less motivated, and less likely to become involved in institutional training programs. Bullock, 1990; Fejes-Mendoza, 1987; Westendorp, 1986; Allen-Hagen, 1991; Maguire, 1991).

Even in juvenile facilities, prisonization attitudes are an issue. Prisonization is the adoption of the "inmate code", a belief set that places a premium on toughness, exploitative inter-personal relationships, and inmate solidarity. Hostility towards the law, the legal system and the institution are key components of this inmate code. Institutional games are outgrowths of prisonization. They are used to seek attention, gain dominance over staff, make their stay while confined more enjoyable, gain status among their peers, cope with confinement, expedite release, and exploit staff and peers. The degree of prisonization that the inmate possesses plays a big role in his or her ability to benefit from the educational and rehabilitation services while at the institution and the likelihood of re-involvement in delinquent activity upon release (Bartollas, 1983; Thomas, 1983). Homant (1984) states that "it is a lack of values rather than anti-social values that underlies the debilitating process of prisonization." One advantage of deinstitutionalization of large juvenile facilities may well be a decrease in prisonization.

Performance in school is a major factor in the peer group a youth joins. Tracking and ability grouping promote subcultures of under-achievers. School status labels depicting ability, deviance from school norm, potential, and a particular socioeconomic status are related to involvement in delinquency. "The single best predictor of adolescent criminal behavior is a long-established pattern of early school antisocial behavior. A member of such a deviant group has an almost 70% chance of experiencing a first felony arrest within two years" (Walker, 1991). When a youth is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

involved in juvenile court, the determination of whether to process the youth as a delinquent is based on school status labels. (Amster, 1984; Noblit, 1976; Harper, 1988; Finn, 1988; Walker, 1991)

Intelligence is now recognized as a primary factor in a person's coping abilities. Since the mid-80s, there has been an increase in the institutionalization of intelligent and capable youth. These brighter delinquents have been found to have more severe psychiatric disorders and to be educational underachievers. However, the average IQs of institutionalized youth, in general, fall within the upper limits of the below-average range and the lower limits of the average range. A child with lower intelligence frequently is more vulnerable to suggestions of deviant behavior and less able to avoid detection. The child's inability to succeed at school progresses into a pattern of poorly-assimilated learning abilities, delays in mastering the basic academic skills, non-completion of schoolwork, and retention in grade level (Gagne, 1977; Harper, 1988; Meltzer, 1984; Finn, 1988).

The child's self-esteem deteriorates when he or she cannot learn and perform well enough to gain teacher approval and academic achievement. As a result, the child is neither motivated nor encouraged to improve. If school personnel do provide some encouragement, it is frequently rejected or has only short-term effect because it is not reinforced at home or in the community. Since many children prefer their peers to think of them as aggressive, brave and tough rather than mentally deficient, they adopt an attitude of disengagement, academic disinterest, and a strong need for independence. Academic difficulties are accompanied by behavior problems. Truancy begins as early as elementary school, often encouraged by the family's frequent moves and changes of schools. Resistance to traditional authority, alienation, and a strong need for independence increase and are reinforced in the community as the child begins spending more and more time on the streets. (Hawkins, 1987; Walker, 1991; Gagne, 1977; Harper, 1988; Meltzer, 1984; Finn, 1988)

Due to repeated academic setbacks, youth in correctional schools typically function an average of three years below grade level. They lack commitment to learning and respect for authority. They come to the facility without educational records. Their length of stays vary from a few days to a few years (Ball, 1982; Carter, 1987; Westat, 1991; Roush, 1983; Garfunkel, 1986; Gehring, 1985; Rabak, 1991; Wolford, 1985; Bullock, 1983; Hawkins, 1983; DeGraw; Sedlak, 1990).

In spite of all the above-mentioned negatives, many correctional students participate in their only positive educational experience while incarcerated. Class size is small; teaching strategies are more appropriate for this kind of student. They do not have the option of being truant. There is the positive effect of combining the disciplined, structured environment of the institution with a structured educational program. This is especially true for the learning disabled student. Unfortunately, for most correctional education students, this is their final educational experience. (Rutherford, 1985; Bullock, 1983; Haberman, 1986; Wolford, 1987; Forbes, 1991; Ball, 1982; Amster, 1984; Westat, 1991)

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

Inmates' learning disabilities and learning deficiencies are a key issue in correctional education. The prevalence of some handicapping condition--emotional disturbance, learning disability, mental retardation--among incarcerated youth is disproportionate to the prevalence among non-delinquent youth in the general population. A range of 30% to 75% for delinquent youth compared to a prevalence rate of 6.5% to 13.7% among all school-age children (Murphy, 1986). Rutherford, Nelson, and Wolford (1985) found that 28% of juvenile offenders were educationally handicapped. Eggleston (1984) identified between 35 and 42% of juvenile and adult inmates as educationally handicapped.

Nationally, the exact number and percentage of residents with learning problems is almost impossible to ascertain for the following reasons:

- Research data is difficult to interpret because of inconsistencies in the definitions of learning disabilities and the definition of who is a juvenile.
- Individual state laws and procedures mandate categories and practices which differ from state to state.
- Referral rates are as much a function of teachers, schools, and communities as they are of student behaviors and characteristics.
- Identification of the need for special education services can be made by the public school prior to incarceration, at intake into the facility or during the youth's stay.
- Many facilities compare their students with learning problems to the facility's student population rather than to their student peers in public schools. Therefore, only those students with the most serious problems are placed in special education classes.
- Rutherford (1985) states that, as of 1985, five states offered no special education services; 29 states served at least 90% of their identified special education students. In 1986 he states that only 28% of correctional education teachers were certified in special education and regular classroom teachers were not trained to identify learning disabilities.

Learning-disabled youth are over-represented in the Juvenile Justice System. Nine out of every 100 learning disabled males versus four of every 100 non-learning disabled males are adjudicated delinquents. Although learning disabled youth do not exhibit more delinquent behavior than non-learning disabled youth, they are more frequently involved in violent acts, use greater amounts of alcohol and marijuana, and have more school discipline problems (Amster, 1984; Broder, 1981).

The following theories for the over-representation of learning disabled youth describe behavior that is mutually reinforcing on the part of the youth and of the adults who deal with them:

1. School failure rationale--Learning disabilities lead to poor academic achievement and subsequent labelling of the student as a "problem student." Negative self-image and behaviors fulfill the label. Feeling frustrated, the learning disabled youth strikes out in anger and retaliation and is placed with other youth with behavior problems. Failure fosters an even greater external locus of control. Decreased attachment to school and lack of commitment to socially accepted courses of action and the learning process follow.
2. Susceptibility rationale--Personality and cognitive deficits cause learning disabled youth to be more vulnerable to delinquent behavior. Impulsiveness, poor ability to learn from experience, poor perception of social cues, suggestibility, tendency to act out, inability to anticipate future consequences of actions and irritability are identifiable traits. These youth follow the lead of more "street smart" youth who are better able to avoid being caught or, if apprehended, can extricate themselves from the situation.
3. Differential treatment hypothesis--Learning disabled youth are treated differently from non- learning disabled youth during arrest and adjudication due to the personality and cognitive deficits cited above. Their abrasive and awkward manner of self-presentation evoke negative responses from the adults in the Juvenile Justice System. The youths' inability to comprehend the significance of abstract ideas seriously impacts their understanding of and response to the Juvenile Justice System (Broder, 1981).

The inability to define accurately and identify this population and the failure of some governmental programs to meet their educational goals clearly indicate the need to develop standards and programs that may better serve them. Special education programming varies state by state and has increased in both quality and quantity since the mid-1980s. However, fewer than 10% of state departments of correctional education fully comply with PL 94-142 despite the fact that there are four independent legal bases for handicapped youths' right to services: the Education for Handicapped Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th

Amendment, and state law. The following reasons are cited:

- lack of interagency agreements and cooperation;
- communication and organizational issues;
- lack of Individual Education Plans (IEPs) upon the youths' arrival;
- shortage of trained staff and administrators knowledgeable of the needs of special education students;
- inadequate assessments;
- difficulty in locating and involving parents or guardians;
- shortage of money;
- misplacement of students in appropriate programs;
- high turnover of student population from transfers and releases; and
- lack of effective transition following release.

(Rincher, 1990; Coffey, 1983; Smith, 1983; Richey, 1982; Pasternak, 1988; Forbes, 1991; Watanabe, 1990; Warboys, 1986; Murphy, 1986; Bell, 1990; Rutherford, 1985; Finn, 1988; Grande, 1988 and ; Garfunkel, 1986; Keilitz, 1986)

The types of special education programs vary according to the state. However, they can be grouped in to three categories: self-contained classrooms, resource centers, and mainstream classrooms. Because students average three years behind grade level, many correctional schools rely on curricula aimed at younger pupils and do not try to relate the curriculum to the world outside the classroom. There is a great need for curriculum designs appropriate for special education students which parallel the content of curriculum for regular correctional students. Curriculum needs to be relevant to older adolescents who have failed in the regular educational system (Rutherford, 1985 and 1988; Eggleston, 1990; Forbes, 1991; Grande, 1988).

Many correctional educators suggest that an ideal model for special education services in correctional schools would be a continuum of services incorporating educational, vocational, and special education needs. Educators should have degrees, or at the minimum, courses in correctional education and special education. A coordination of efforts on the part of all who service the handicapped juvenile in correctional schools is essential.

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION MODELS

The articles reviewed focused on two models of correctional education: incremental and developmental. The incremental model has its foundations in behavioral psychology. In rehabilitation terms it is called the medical model which views criminal behavior as the result of individual psychological deficiencies that can be changed by behavior modification. In educational terms, this model is called the diagnostic/prescriptive model. Both models involve an authority figure evaluating the student/client and developing an individualized plan for change that focuses on specific skill or knowledge deficits. The authority figure becomes the "fixer".

The developmental model is based in cognitive psychology. It focuses on cognitive functions and designs instructional strategies consistent with thinking processes. Students' personal development according to internal criteria such as attitudes and thinking skills is emphasized over the external criteria of specific knowledge and skill attainment.

The Canadian correctional education paradigm has its foundations in the developmental model and includes the following elements:

- cognitive instruction which addresses the role of cognitive development on social behaviors and the need for inmates to improve their interpersonal skills;
- participatory decision-making and the application of democratic methods such as seeing others' viewpoints;

- Kohlberg's system of moral development which is based on ideas about justice and uses strategies of discussions about moral problems, role modeling, and living in a democratic community; and
- the emphasis on humanities instruction as an arena for interpersonal cognitive development.

The Canadian paradigm serves as the foundation for the latest trends in correctional education which focus on cognitive skill development and the integration of rehabilitation and education. (Collins, 1988; Duguid, 1990; Gehring, 1988; Eggleston, 1986)

TEACHING APPROACHES

Most correctional education focuses on the completion of credits for return to public school classes at higher grade levels, raising achievement test scores, or preparation for the GED rather than acquiring functional skills. Functional skills are needed to live independently in today's society and to maintain personal, social, and occupational competence.

Functional curricula can be productive for students who do poorly in school, perceive school to be an irrelevant entity and are classified as potential school drop-outs. Curriculum content can be related to students' past experiences, present situations, and future issues they will face (Fredericks, 1987; C. Smith, 1987; Eggleston, 1990; Semmens, 1989; Watanabe, 1990).

Innovative correctional education teaching strategies shown to be effective in improving learning and attitudes toward learning among students include:

- literacy programs using computers; (Correctional Education Association, 1988; Jones, 1989)
- case management of individualized educational plans which are developed from the results of a series of diagnostic tests, followed while the youth is incarcerated and forwarded after release to the appropriate school; (Mayer, 1982; Correctional Education Association, 1988)
- involvement of special education youth in their own IEP planning process; (Eggleston, 1990; Frassier, 1986)
- community involvement; (Correctional Education Association, 1988; Buzzell, 1988)
- integration of LRE, which focuses on development of cognitive and social interaction skills needed for citizenship and teaches about the legal system and legal processes via inter-active teaching strategies (Buzzell, 1988).
- Experiential programs, such as wilderness programs, that rely on group interaction, cooperation, and organization and provide action-oriented tasks which, as they are mastered, provide a sense of personal and group empowerment (Mixdorf, 1989; Van Nagel, 1986)
- moral education programs which provide offenders with new thinking strategies and skills. Moral education emerged in the early 1980s within the correctional education field. It is controversial among many correctional educators. Underlying this approach is the theory that individuals make moral judgments based on their stage of moral development, their sensitivity to others, and their feelings of obligation to act out of principles rather than self-interest. Moral development is viewed as a cognitive process and reorganization of the thinking processes. Arbuthnot (1983) states that "from the literature reviewed, it appears that offenders--both juvenile and adult--are generally

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

characterized by lower than normal reasoning development." An andragogical, or student-centered and generated, teaching style which involves the student as an active partner and responsible for her or his own learning is used as opposed to the usual pedagogical style which is teacher-centered and generated. Participatory and cooperative learning activities are based on meaningful topics such as values of life, property, law, truth, conscience, punishment, affiliation, and democracy. They are problem-centered rather than subject-centered. Duguid (1988) states that "content of the curriculum is less crucial than the pedagogy chosen and the quality of the teachers. (Arbuthnot, 1983; Fox, 1989; Wiley, 1988 and 1989; Fox, 1989; Homant, 1984; Goldstein, 1986; McDougall, 1990)

- Multi-disciplinary approaches with learning modules developed on life skill topics such as alcohol and other drug abuse and dependency; personal development, work assistance; communication, problem-solving, etc. Reading remediation instruction is included in some programs. Cooperative learning strategies and experiential sessions are used. Social interaction is emphasized over content. (Gehring, 1989; CEA, 1988; Ferguson, 1990; Montgomery, 1987; Van Nagel, 1986; Grand, 1988)

Specific multi-disciplinary approaches include:

a. Structured learning training, a systematic, psycho-educational intervention which teaches a 50-skill curriculum of prosocial behaviors. In small groups after appropriate behaviors are modeled, youth role-play to practice these new behaviors. Performance feedback is given to the "actors: after each roleplay. The youth are encouraged to practice skills in all areas and activities of their daily program so they can transfer the skills they have learned (Goldstein, Correctional Education Association, 1988; Van Nagel, 1986).

b. Aggression replacement training, an outgrowth of structured learning and composed of three types of interventions: (1) behavioral--structured learning training as described above; (2) affective--anger control training in which youth are taught to identify triggers for anger, aggression, and other antisocial behavior and how to respond to these triggers less impulsively and more reflectively. (3) cognitive--moral education as previously described with themes relative to the juveniles' lives such as values of life, property, law, truth, conscience, punishment, and affiliation. (Goldstein, 1986; McDougall, 1990)

c. Positive Peer Culture which is based on a peer group approach to behavior change, helping others, and building a positive self-concept. Youth engage in group and cooperative learning experiences. In the groups youth learn to identify behaviors resulting from low self-image, and lack of consideration for self and others, how to accept responsibility for the behavior rather than displace on to another person or event and how to help others (Laufenberg, 1987).

d. Davidson (1988) advocates a multi-disciplinary approach to literacy education to improve students' communication and group participation skills in addition to basic literacy skills while they study substantive and interesting content.

- Cognitive behavioral skills training, a treatment approach that targets both underlying cognitive processes and overt behavior and is used to teach basic skills; (Duguid, 1990; Hawkins, 1991).

TRANSITION BACK TO THE COMMUNITY

Transition is the process involving three components-- referral, program placement, follow-up--after a youth leaves the institution, detention or training school, and goes back into the community to re-establish ties in a normalized setting. Transition between institution and community is a key area and one which has been largely neglected, especially for special education students. Successful negotiation of this phase helps deter recidivism. Ideally, the continuum between educational services in the institution and those provided in the community should be unbroken. However, the reality is that problems prevent an unbroken continuum. Local schools are unaware of institutions' school programs. Timely transfer of school records does not occur and they sometimes never arrive. Transfer of information about special education needs usually does not occur although PL 94-142 mandates that there be a continuum of services for special education students. Communication among school, supervising probation or parole offices, and parents or guardians generally only occurs during crises. No feedback about the youth's progress in the community is given to institutional school staff which hinders program evaluation.

Although most youth do return to their families and previous schools, many are placed with foster families, in residential programs, independent living situations, or chemical dependency or mental health treatment programs, and remain dependent on the social service system. According to "Unlocking Learning: Chapter 1 in Correctional Facilities, the Final Report: National Study of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program," The youth's age is the single factor that appears to be most closely related to returning to school and remaining enrolled beyond five months. The younger the youth the greater the likelihood that she or he will continue in school. Other than a lack of interest in school, the most-cited reason for dropping out of school was the need to work to support themselves and/or their family (Wolford, 1985; Maddox, 1984; Sutton, 1989; Rutherford, 1988; Forbes, 1991; Bullock, 1990; Westat, 1991; Amster, 1984; Watanabe, 1990).

Sutton (1989) lists the following goals for transition programs which represent three main areas of focus--educational, vocational, and social:

- self-help/social/survival skill training
- improvement of self-control
- development of family and community involvement
- student awareness of social services
- development of crime-free attitudes
- remediation of attitudinal deficits (Sutton, 1989)

HABILITATION, NOT REHABILITATION

The need is for habilitation, not rehabilitation. The traditional correctional education formula of knowledge --> skills --> attitudes needs to be altered to attitudes --> skills --> knowledge. Emerging changes in correctional education are linked to needs of confined learners, concepts of personal development, and empowerment (Gehring, 1989). Looking ahead to the 21st century, the economic and social context of learning is being integrated into the education of needed social and thinking knowledge and skills. Arbuthnot (1983) says "In sum, it is essential that correctional educators work toward creating environments or moral atmospheres in which inmates can practice and see in practice, social systems based on democratic principles. . ."

Education as treatment is not a new concept. In early years, disciplined, structured educational/work experience was considered the best means of preparing a person to function in society. Then came the introduction of individual and group therapies with

competition among the adherents of the different treatment approaches. The selection of a treatment approach is often more dependent on the clinician's personal preference than on the client's needs. The appropriateness of traditional therapies for clients with greater personal, economic, cultural, conformance and social deficits than have ever been seen is being questioned (Albrecht, 1991; Ross, 1988; Rabak, 1991).

In the education as treatment approach, social problems are approached cognitively with students studying topics' causes, efforts, and outcomes. Although personal disclosure is not required or forced, it is permitted. Class is a learning laboratory for a specific issue. Curriculum used can be selected according to students' needs, interests, and abilities. Innovative material, modalities, and methods can be integrated with traditional therapeutic approaches. For example, thinking and social skill development can progress into the teaching of social problems and the application of these skills. Then the student participates in programs to meet basic education, vocational education and personal development needs. Social and thinking skills continue as a component of the individual's program (Arbuthnot, 1983; Albrecht, 1991).

COGNITIVE SKILL DEVELOPMENT--WAVE OF THE FUTURE?

During the last fifteen years there has been a gradual shift from the "positivist" school of criminology which views crime as the result of a variety of social ills which degrade human dignity and promote deviant behavior towards the "classical" school which views crime as a result of a person's making destructive decisions because she or he has low self-control and finds gratification in committing the crime. The positivist remedy is to teach academic and vocational skills. The classical remedy is cognitive skill development.

The following cognitive deficits have been linked to criminal behavior:

- difficulty with delaying gratification;
- inability to consider consequences of behavior;
- low frustration tolerance;
- learned helplessness;
- externalization of blame;
- a view of the world in absolute terms;
- inflexible, uncreative, and simplistic thinking processes;
- misinterpretation of others' actions and intentions;
- inability to distinguish between one's own emotional states, thoughts, and views and those of others; and
- lack of consideration and empathy for others.

These deficits are not related to learning disabilities or low intelligence. They are deficits in social or inter-personal reasoning. Inmates' personal histories, in addition to the content and quality of their lives, affect how they think, problem-solve, and act on their values. Cognitive processes and skills that need to be improved include perception, generalization, abstraction, deduction, inference, reasoning, problem-solving, imagination, self-analysis, and self-awareness, recognizing and solving problems, developing alternatives, being aware of consequences, setting goals, taking social perspectives, egocentricity, delaying gratification, motivation, and thinking styles. (Gehring, 1988; Novotny, 1991; Fabiano, 1991; Ross, 1988; Research and Statistics Branch, 1991; Duguid, 1988; Samenow, 1991).

Cognitive development approaches include: self-control training, structured learning training, aggression replacement training, cooperative learning, values education, and empathy training. These approaches use the following techniques: rational

self-analysis, means-ends reasoning, critical thinking, social perspective taking, inter-personal problem-solving, audio-visual presentations, interactive teaching strategies, and role-playing. The emphasis is on process and not content. The techniques are enjoyable and engage students' interest and motivate them to learn (Fabiano, 1991; Duguid, 1991; Buzzell, 1991; Laufenberg, 1987; Ross, 1988; Van Nagel; McDougall, 1991; Goldstein, 1986; Hawkins, 1991).

Cognitive skills development and social skills training promote a sense of connection to other people and society and the ability to work within a group. If implemented properly, it empowers individuals to intervene and take control of their own life regardless of their own social, economic, or personal development issues. It promotes prosocial thinking, behavior, and values. New cognitive skills are taught and enhanced. Students are given an opportunity to breakthrough their shell of self-involvement.

The process of learning can be applied to other areas in the student's life. Teachers can base problem-solving projects on moral dilemmas and design them to promote learning and the application of critical thinking skills. Inmates begin to practice skills while still in the institution which improves the environment and eases the custodial staff's burden. Youth are encouraged to work together cooperatively in small group activities which impact on biases and prejudicial attitudes. A variety of curriculum options maintains a dynamic system. Curriculum can be adapted to students' needs and the make-up of the student group.

Cognitive skills development and social skills training have led to improving staff and inmate morale, promoting a team spirit, generating staff enthusiasm and interest, and stimulating collaborative work habits among staff and students. All staff become teachers and role models for the students. Academic achievement becomes a valued activity within the institution.

The cognitive model can be a means of integrating different views of the factors involved in criminal behavior--sociological, neurological, nutritional, psychological, and environmental. These factors impact on a person's cognitive development and the likelihood of her or his involvement in criminal behavior. The cognitive model has implications for education in both prevention and rehabilitation efforts. (Rabak, 1991; Merren, 1991; Samenow, 1991; Albrecht, 1991; Roby, 1991; Ross, 1988; Duguid, 1988; Hains, 1987; Novotny, 1991; Rubenstein, 1991).

WHAT ROLE CAN LRE PLAY IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION SETTINGS?

In considering the role of LRE in correctional education, the following questions need to be addressed:

- How does LRE assist in the habilitation of youth?
- How can LRE respond to Duguid's (1990) proposal that "assisting inmates in viewing citizenship as the possession of rights and taking responsibility for one's actions might have implications for curriculum and pedagogy. . . "?
- How can LRE fit into multi-disciplinary approaches such as structured learning training, aggression-reduction training, and positive peer culture?
- What role can LRE take in cognitive behavioral and moral education approaches?
- In what ways can LRE be a vehicle for fulfilling the recommendation of the Chapter 1 Final Report (1991) of "providing learning environments that differ from the traditional environment associated with failure, and promoting lively interaction between students and teachers. . . ."?
- Can LRE assist in deterring recidivism?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- What role can LRE play in the development of curricular designs appropriate for special education youth and address their need to acquire functional skills?
- Can LRE be a vehicle for uniting a facility's security, clinical and educational staff in "creating environments or moral atmosphere in which inmates can practice, and see in practice social systems based on democratic principles" (Arbuthnot, 1983).
- Will bringing community resource people into the institution be a vehicle for developing a community approach to juvenile justice and decrease the isolation felt by juvenile justice correctional educators?

The only article that specifically addresses LRE in juvenile justice settings is Buzzell's article about LRE in the state boys training school in Eldora, Iowa (1988), which described his study of the impact of the LRE program on inmate behavior and attitudes.

The literature review suggests that LRE in juvenile justice settings has a future as a significant contributor in the education of the incarcerated juvenile. Bringing community resource people into facilities increases public awareness about correctional educators' contributions and needs. LRE theory and strategies complement the newer trends in correctional education. LRE lessons can be adapted to a variety of settings. LRE can be a vehicle for intra-institutional cooperation and cooperation between the education, treatment, and corrections systems. It can be a vehicle for a community approach to juvenile justice and decrease the isolation felt by juvenile justice professionals.

ORGANIZATIONS AND CLEARINGHOUSES

Correctional Education Association
American Correctional Association
National Juvenile Detention Association
National Center for Juvenile Justice
National Association of Juvenile Correctional Agencies
International Conference of Administrators of Residential
Centers for Youth
Center for Studies in Criminal Justice
National Juvenile Detention Association
North American Association of Wardens and Superintendents
National Council on Crime and Delinquency Clearinghouse
Rutgers University Criminal Justice Collection
Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service
ERIC Clearinghouse
Criminal Justice Periodical Index
Lexis

DEFINITIONS

PL 94-142 The Education for All Handicapped Children Act--Designed to ensure a free and appropriate education for all handicapped students; requires state education agencies to supervise all other agencies involved in the education of any and all handicapped students in correctional facilities.

Correctional Education--an organized and individualized self-help strategy to interrupt nonsocial or antisocial behavior through vocational and academic learning activities that foster social attitudes and equip students in contact with the Criminal Justice system for lives as responsible community members

Diversion--a program generally for first offenders of traffic or minor criminal offenses in which they attend educational classes, participate in community service or a combination of both

Adjudication--a judicial process in which a youth is determined to be delinquent and a sentence is imposed

Disposition--in court cases, the administration of a legal finding of guilt or innocence and the imposition of a sentence if there is a finding of guilt

Transition--the process of referral, living environment and program placement, and follow-up for a youth leaving an institution, detention, or training school and re-entering the community to re-establish ties

Community-based programs--structured correctional and rehabilitation programs based in monitored living environments in the local community in which youth can work on education, employment, and treatment needs and becoming self-sufficient

Detention--a facility that provides protection and control for youth who are waiting for disposition of their cases or transfer to another facility

Training Schools--state-operated institutions for adjudicated delinquents convicted of felonies or violations of court orders and are in need of a more structured and secure facility that an community-based program

LITERATURE REVIEW REFERENCES

Albrecht, L. 1991. Decoding and Encoding Life. Journal of Correctional Education Association. 42(2):60-64.

Allen-Hagen, B. 1991. Public Juvenile Facilities: Children in Custody 1989. OJJDP Update on Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Justiace Bulletin. pp. 2-7.

Amster, J. and P. Lazarus. 1984. Identifying Learning Problems in Youthful Offenders: Rationale and Model. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation. 8(4):65-77.

Angle, T. 1982. The Development of Educational Programs in American Adult Prisons and Juvenile Reformatories During the 19th Century. Journal of Correctional Education Association. 33(3):4-7.

Arbuthnot, J., and Gordon, D. 1983. Moral Reasoning Development in Correctional Intervention. Journal of Correctional Education Association. 34(4):133-138.

Atwood R., M. Gold, and R. Taylor. 1989. Two Types of Delinquents and Their Institutional Adjustment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 57(1):68-75.

Ball, E., L. Parker, and J. Saunders. 1982. Incarceration and the Rate of Achievement of Learning Disabled Juvenile Delinquents. Journal of Experimental Education. 51(2):54-56.

Bartollas, C., and C. Sieverdes. 1983. Institutional Games Played by Confined Juveniles. Adolescence. 8(71):609-617.

Bell, R. 1990. Determining Needs Asssessment and Evaluation Procedures in Prison Education: Issues and Concerns. Presentation at the Further Education Staff College Conference, Bristol, England.

Bosma, A. 1987. Teaching Inmates in Small Jails: Teacher Reactions. Journal of Correctional Education Association. 38(3):114-118.

Broder, P., and N. Dunivant, E. Smith, L. Sutton. 1981. Further Observations on the Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency. Journal of Educational Psychology. 73(6):838-850.

Brown, R. 1990. Prison Education: Long-term Aims, The Yearbook of Correctional Education. pp. 97-103.

Bullock, R., K. Hosie, M. Little, and S. Millham. 1990. Secure Accomodation for Very Difficult Adolescents: Some Recent Research Findings. Journal of Adolescence. 13:205-216.

Bullock, T., and R. Arends, F. Mills. 1983. Implementing Educational Services in a Detention Facility. Juvenile and Family Court Journal. 8:21-29.

Buzzell, T. 1988. Law Related Education in a Juvenile Justice Setting: Applications in the Iowa State Training School. New Designs for Youth Development. 8(2, 3, 4)

Carter, D. 1987. Federal Dateline. Journal of Correctional Education Association. 38(1):30-32.

Carter, G. 1983. From Institution to Community: A Reintegration Preparation Program Model, for Institutionalized Juvenile Offenders at Echo Glen Children's Center. Dissertation. Seattle University.

Collins, M. 1988. Towards a Distinctive Vocation for Prison Educators: Some Key Concerns and Relevant Strategies. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(1):24-28.

Cook, J., and G. Hill. 1990. Preplacement Characteristics and Educational Status of Handicapped and Non-Handicapped Youthful Offenders. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(4):194-198.

Correctional Education Association. 1988. Learning Behind Bars: Selected Educational Programs from Juvenile, Jail and Prison Facilities. Laurel, MD.

Correctional Education Association. 1988. Standards for Adult and Junveile Correctional Educational Programs. laurel, MD.

Davidson, H. 1988. Meaningful Literacy Education in Prison. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(2):76-81.

DeGraw, D. 1987. A Study of Coorectional Educators in Adult Correctional Institutions. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(1):18-20.

Duguid, S. 1990. Education for What: Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Program Objectives. The Yearbook of Correctional Education. pp. 113-128.

Duguid, S. 1988. "To Inform Their Discretion" Prison Education and Empowerment. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(4):174-181.

Eggleston, C. 1990. Curriculum Issues for the Incarcerated Handicapped Learner. The Yearbook of Correctional Education. pp 129-137.

Eggleston, C., and T. Gehring. 1986. Correctional Education Paradigms in the United States and Canada. Journal of Correctional Education. 37(2):86-92.

Fabiano, E. 1991. How Education Can Be Correctional and How Corrections Can Be Educational. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):100-107.

Fabiano, E., D. Robinson, and F. Porporino. 1991. A Preliminary Assessment of the Cognitive Skills Training Program: Living Skills Programming: Program Description, research Findings and Implementation Strategy.

Farmer, J. 1990. Juvenile Exploitation of Juvenile Correctional Workers: A Content Analysis. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(3):118-119.

Fejes-Mendoza, K., and R. Rutherford. 1987. Learning Handicapped and Nonlearning Handicapped Female Juvenile Offenders' Educational and Criminal Profiles. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(4):148-153.

Ferguson, E., and J. Haaven. 1990. On the Design of Motivating Learning Environments for Intellectually Disabled Offenders. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(1):32-34.

Finn, J., M. Stott, and K. Zarkany. 1988. School Performance of Adolescents in Juvenile Court. Urban Education 23(2):150-161.

Forbes, M. 1991. Special Education in Juvenile Correctional Facilities: A Literature Review. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(1):31-35.

Fox, T. 1989. The Necessity of Moral Education in Prisons. Journal of Correctional Education. 40(1):20-25.

Freasier, A. 1986. Involving Juvenile Offenders in the IEP Planning Process. Journal of Correctional Education 37(4):134-139.

Fredericks, B., and V. Evans. 1987. Functional Curriculum in Special Education in the Criminal Justice System, pp.189-214.

Gagne, E. 1977. Educating Delinquents: A Review of Research. Journal of Special Education. 11:13-27.

Garfunkel, F. 1986. The Conditions of Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 37(4):157-160.

Gehring, T. 1985. The Correctional Education/Prison Reform Link: Part 1, 1840-1900. Journal of Correctional Education. 36(4):140-146.

Gehring, T. 1986. The Correctional Education/Prison Reform Link: 1913-1940 and Conclusion. Journal of Correctional Education. 37(1):14-17.

Gehring, T. 1988. The Connection Between Democracy and Cognitive Processes in Correctional Education, Journal of Correctional Education, 39(2):62-69.

Gehring, T. 1988. Five Principles of Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(4):164-169.

Gehring, T. 1989. A Change in Our Way of Thinking. Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4):166-173.

Gehring, T. 1990. Results of a Nationwide Survey: Correctional Education Organizational Structure Trends. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(4):174-181.

Goldstein, A., B. Glick, S. Reiner, D. Zimmerman, T. Coultry, and D. Gold. 1986. Aggression Replacement Training: A Comprehensive Intervention for the Acting-Out Delinquent. Journal of Correctional Education. 37(3):120-126.

Grande, C. 1988. Educational Therapy for the Failing and Frustrated Student Offender. Adolescence. 23:889-897.

Grande, C. and M. Koorland. 1988. A Complex Issue: Special Education in Corrections. Children and Youth Services Review. 10(4):345-350.

Haberman, M., and L. Quinn. 1986. The High School Re-Entry Myth: A Follow-Up Study of Juveniles Released from Two Correctional High Schools in Wisconsin. Journal of Correctional Education. 37(3):114-117.

Hains, A. and A. Hains. 1987. The Effects of a Cognitive Strategy Intervention on the Problem-Solving Abilities of Delinquent Youths. Journal of Adolescence. 10:399-413.

Hamm, M. 1988. Making Changes in Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(4):146-152.

Harper, G. 1988. Mental Ability and Academic Achievement of Male Juvenile Delinquents. Journal of Correctional Education 39(1):18-22.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hawkins, D. 1989. Risk-Focused Prevention: Prospects and Strategies. Presented by D. Hawkins to Federal Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC.

Hawkins, D., H. Doueck, and D. Lishner. 1988. Changing Teaching Practices in Mainstream Classrooms to Improve Bonding and Behavior of Low Achievers. American Educational Research Journal. 25(1):31-50.

Hawkins, D., J. Jenson, R. Catalano, and E. Wells. 1991. Effects of a Skills Training Intervention with Juvenile Delinquents. Research on Social Work Practices. 1(2):107-121.

Hawkins, D. and T. Lam. 1987. Teacher Practices, Social Development and Delinquency. Prevention of Delinquent Behavior. Beverly Hills: Sage Press, pp. 241-274.

Hawkins, D., and D. Lishner. 1987. Etiology and Prevention of Antisocial Behavior in Children and Adolescents, in Childhood Aggression and Violence: Sources of Influence, Prevention, and Control. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 263-282.

Hawkins, D., D. Lishner, and R. Catalano, 1985. Childhood Predictors and the Prevention of Adolescent Substance Abuse. Etiology of Drug Abuse: Implications for Prevention. Washington, DC, NIDA, DHHS Publication No. ADM85-1385.

Hodges, R., and J. Evans. 1983. Effects of Three Instructional Strategies with Juvenile Delinquents of Differing Learning Styles. Current Trends in Correctional Education. pp 57-65.

Homant, R. 1984. On the Role of Values in Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 35 (1):8-12.

Hunter, R. 1987. Law-Related Educational Practice and Delinquency Theory. The International Journal of Social Education. 2(2):52-64.

Jones, M. and M. Wendel. 1989. Computer Assisted Parallel Education for Incarcerated Youth. American School Board Association Journal. pp. 11-14.

Keilitz, I., and Dunivant, N. 1986. The Relationship Between Learning Disability and Juvenile Delinquency: Current State of Knowledge. Remedial and Special Education. 7(3):18-26.

Laufenberg, R. 1987. Positive Peer Culture: A Peer Group Approach to Behavior Change. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(4):138-143.

Maddox, M., S. Webb, Allen, L., T. Faust, Deborah Abrams, and A. Lynch. 1984. Transitioning Adjudicated Youth Back to Community Schools. Journal of Correctional Education. 35(4):124-128.

Mayer, E., and R. Hoffman. 1982. A Comparison of the Effects of Individual Instruction with Group Instructor on the Academic Achievement and Self-Concept of Youthful Offenders. Journal of Correctional Education. 33(4):11-13.

McDougall, C. 1990. Anger Control Training with Young Offenders. The Yearbook of Correctional Education. pp. 319-324.

Maguire, K. and T. Flanagan, eds. 1991. Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. p. 568.

Meltzer, L., M. Levine, W. Karniski, J. Palfrey, and S. Clarke. 1984. An Analysis of the Learning Styles of Adolescent Delinquents. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 17:600-608.

Merren, J. 1991. Crime, Social Education, and the Twenty-First Century. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):50-56.

Mesinger, J. 1984. Some Thoughts on Integrating Special Education with Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 35(3):77-78.

Michalek, W. 1988. Correctional Education: Skill Acquisition and Moral Enterprise. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(1):6-10.

Miller, H. 1987. A Study of Maryland Prison Teachers Perceived to be Effective. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(2):65-70.

Mixdorf, L., and P. Paugh. 1989. Experiential Education and Corrections: Teaching through Action. Corrections Today. 8:38-42.

Montgomery, D. 1987. SEED Curriculum (Social, Emotional, Educational Development). Journal of Correctional Education. 38(1):12-20.

Murphy, D. 1986. The Prevalence of Handicapping Conditions among Juvenile Delinquents. Remedial and Special Education. 7(3):7-17.

Noblit, G. 1976. Adolescent Experience and Delinquency: School versus Subculture. Youth and Society. 8:27-44.

Novotny, A., R. Seifert, and D. Werner. 1991. Collective Learning: A Pro-Social Teaching Strategy for Prison Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):80-88.

Pasternak, R., R. Portillos, and H. Henry. 1988. Providing an Appropriate Education to Adjudicated and Incarcerated Juvenile Delinquents: The Challenge to our Correctional Education Administrators. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(4):154-159.

Pecht, H. 1983. The Emergent CE Profession: Special Problems Require Tested Criteria for the Selection of Effective Teachers. Journal of Correctional Education. 34(3):85-87.

Rabak, T. and J. Walker. 1991. Envisioning and Creating Change: Project Social Responsibility. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):94-100.

Refflett, S., 1983. The Correctional School and the Public Mind. Journal of Correctional Education. 34(2):40-43.

Richey, D., and T. Willis. 1982. Improving Education for Handicapped, Incarcerated Youth: Priority Setting and Problem Identification by Front-Line Staff during Inservice Training. Journal of Correctional Education. 32(4):27-30.

Rincker, J., T. Reilly, and S. Braaten. 1990. Academic and Intellectual Characteristics of Adolescent Juvenile Offenders. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(3):124-131.

Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada. 1991. Effectiveness of the Cognitive Skills Training Program: From Pilot to National Implementation.

Roby, P. and H. Dwyer. 1991. Through the Looking Glass Darkly: Teaching for Thinking. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):74-78.

Ross, R. and E. Fabiano. 1985. Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation. Johnson City, TN. Institute of Social Sciences and the Arts.

Ross, R., E. Fabiano, and R. Ross. 1988. (Re)Habilitation Through Education: A Cognitive Model for Corrections. Journal of Correctional Education. 39(2):44-47.

Roth, H., and C. Nicholson 1990. Differences in Learning Styles Between Successfully and Unsuccessfully Mainstreamed Violent and Assaultive Youth. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(3):134-137.

Roush, D. 1983. Content and Process of Detention Education. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation. 3/4:21-36.

Rubenstein, F. 1991. A Facility-Wide Approach to Social Skills Training. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):88-93.

Rutherford Jr., R. M. Nelson, B. Wolford. 1985. Special Education in the Most Restrictive Environment. Journal of Special Education. 19:59-71.

Rutherford, Jr., R., M. Nelson, B. Wolford. 1986. Special Education Programming in Juvenile Corrections. Remedial and Special Education. 7(3):27-33.

Samenow, S. 1991. Correcting Errors of Thinking in the Socialization of Offenders. Journal of Correctional Education. 42(2):56-60.

Sedlak, R. and D. Stephenson. 1987. Correlates of Excellence in School Leadership: Implications for Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(2):53-57.

Sedlak, R., and S. Karcz. 1990. Descriptive Study of Teaching Practices and the Efficacy of Correctional Education. The Yearbook of Correctional Education. pp. 325-341.

Semmens, R. 1989. Practical Theory in Correctional Education. Journal of Correctional Education. 40(2):90-94.

Sherer, M. 1983. The Incarcertion Period and Educational Achievements of Juvenile Delinquents. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 10(1)109-120.

Smith, B., and B. Ramirez, R. Rutherford. 1983. Special Education Services in Youth Correctional Facilities. Journal of Correctional Education. 34(4):108-112.

Smith, C. 1987. Legal Education in Prisons: Special Problems and Opportunities. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(4):132-135.

Sutherland, D., and G. Schwartz-DuPrere. 1986. Federally Supported Correctional Special Education Personnel Training Programs. Journal of Correctional Education. 37(4):162-164.
Sutton, J. and Whittier. 1989. Transition Programs in Juvenile Corrections: Results of a Nationwide Survey. Journal of Correctional Education. 40(4):162-165.

Thomas, C., J. Hyman, and L. Winfree. 1983. The Impact of Confinement on Juveniles, Youth & Society. 14(3):301-319.

Van Nagel, C., and L. Foley, M. Dixon, J. Kauffman. 1986. A Review of the Treatment Methods for the Rehabilitation of Juvenile Delinquents. Journal of Correctional Education 37(4):140-145.

Walker, H., and R. Sylwester. 1991. Where is School Along the Path to Prison? Educational Leadership. pp. 14-16.

Watanabe, A., and C. Forgnone. 1990. The Mentally Handicapped Juvenile Offender: A Call for Transition. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(1):20-24.

Warboys, L. and C. Shauffer. 1986. Legal Issues in Providing Special Educational Services to Handicapped Inmates. Remedial and Special Education. 7(3):34040.

Westat, Inc., in affiliation with Policy Studies Associates, Inc. and Research & Training Associates, Inc. for the United States Department of Education. 1991. Unlocking Learning: Chapter 1 in Correctional Facilities. Executive Summary.

Westendorp, F., K. Brink, M. Roberson, and I. Ortiz. 1986. Variables Which Differentiate Placement of Adolescents into Juvenile Justice or Mental Health Systems. Adolescence. 21(81):23-35.

Wiley, L. 1988. Moral Education in a Correctional Setting: Reaching the Goal by a Different Road. Journal of Offender counseling, Services & Rehabilitation. 12(2):161-173.

Wiley, L. 1989. The Correctional Educator as Moral Change Agent. Journal of Correctional Education. 40(1):12-18.

Wolford, B. 1985. Correctional Education Opportunities for Delinquent and Criminal Offenders. Training and Education for Criminal Offenders.

Wolford, B., and R. Snarr. 1987. What is the Goal of Correctional Education? Journal of Correctional Education 38(2):60-63.

LITERATURE REVIEW BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bachera, G., and J. Zaba. 1978. Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency. Journal of Learning disabilities. 11 (4):58-62.

Beck, 1972. Teaching to Captivated Students. Journal of Reading. 21:235-239.

Breed and Krisberg, 1986. Is There a Future? Corrections Today. 12:14-20.

Burke and Simon. 1965. Factors which Precipitate Dropouts and Delinquency. Federal Probation. 29:28-32.

Carbone V. and R. Lynch. 1982. Functional Analysis of Behavior in a Juvenile Detention Facility. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation. 6(3):21-41.

Fink, C., 1990. Special Education Inservice for Correctional Educators. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(4):186-190.

Finke, D., and D. Hawkins. 1985. Organizational Factors Affecting Teacher Collegeality. Report of Center for Social Welfare Research. University of Washington.

Fremont and Wallbrown. 1979. Types of Behavior Problems that May be Encountered in the Classroom. Journal of Education 161:5-24.

Gillmore, M., J. Hawkins, R. Catalano, E. Day, and M. Moore. The Structure of Problem Behaviors in Preadolescence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,

Hamm, M. 1987. The Human Potential Seminar: A Strategy for Teaching Socially Adaptive Behavior in a Correctional Classroom. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(1):4-7.

Hawkins, D., and D. Lishner. 1983. Cooperating to Prevent Delinquency: A School-Based Approach. Paper prepared for National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention.

Hawkins, D., and B. Salisbury. 1983. Delinquency Prevention Programs for Minorities of Color. Social Work Research & Abstracts, National Association of Social Workers, Inc.

Jacobsen, M., and S. Palonsky. 1981. Effects of a LRE Program. Elementary School Journal 82:49-57.

Just, D. 1985. The Relationship Between Delinquent Behavior and Work Values of Noninstitutionalized Youth. Journal of Correctional Education 36(4):148-153.

Kerr D., L. Kent, and T. Lam. Measuring Program Implementation with a Classroom Observation Instrument: Interactive Teaching Map". Evaluation Review. 9(4):461-482.

Linden and Perry. 1982. Effectiveness of Prison Education. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation. 6:43-57.

Mesinger, J. 1987. Educateur Training As a Resource Model for Special/Correctional Educators. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(4):154-159.

Minahan, J. 1990. Mapping the World: Some Thoughts on Teaching the Humanities in Prison. Journal of Correctional Education. 41(1):14-19.

Perlmutter, B. 1987. Delinquency and Learning Disabilities: Evidence for Compensatory Behaviors and Adaptation. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 16:89-95.

Richey D. and M. Miller. 1987. Academic Related Behavior Among Delinquent Boys: Their Self-Ratings and Those of Teachers. Journal of Correctional Education. 38(1):26-28.

Serok and Blum. Rule Violating Behavior of Delinquents and Non-Delinquent Youth. Adolescence. 17:457-464.

Slavin, R. 1983. When Does Cooperative Learning Increase Student Achievement? Psychological Bulletin. 94:429-445.

Wiatrowski, Hansell, Massey, and Wilson. 1982. Curriculum Tracking and Delinquency: Toward an Integration of Education and Delinquency Research. American Sociological Review 47:151-160.

Yurkanin. 1989. Juvenile Corrections: Reaching New Heights. Corrections Today. 51:5-38.

Zarek, D., D. Hawkins, and P. Rogers. 1987. Risk Factors for Adolescent Substance Abuse: Implications for Pediatric Practice. Pediatric Clinics of North America. 34(2):481-493.